

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 Jiangxi Panda Fireworks Co., Ltd., a
7 Chinese entity,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 Douglas Burda, an individual; Konzept LLC, a
11 Nevada limited liability company doing
12 business as Burda IP; Elissa Burda, an
13 individual; Red Apple Fireworks Co., Ltd., a
14 Nevada limited liability company; 1.4g
Holdings, LLC, a Nevada limited liability
company;

15 Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01232-MMD-DJA

Order

16 Steven A. Gibson, Esq. and Jodi Donetta Lowry, Esq.¹ of the law firm Gibson Lexbury,
17 LLP, move to withdraw their representation of Defendants 1.4g Holdings, LLC and Red Apple
18 Fireworks, Co., Ltd. (ECF No. 90). 1.4g and Red Apple did not respond to the motion. But
19 Plaintiff Jiangxi Panda Fireworks, Co., Ltd. did. (ECF No. 95). Jiangxi does not oppose Gibson
20 Lexbury's withdrawal but asks that the Court condition that withdrawal on 1.4g and Red Apple
21 providing their responses to discovery. (*Id.*). Gibson Lexbury did not file a reply. On the reply
22 deadline, Bethany L. Rabe, Esq.; Kimberly Cooper, Esq.; and Mark G. Tratos, Esq. of Greenberg
23 Traurig, LLP filed a substitution of attorney for 1.4g and Red Apple in place of Gibson Lexbury.
(ECF No. 97).

24 The Court declines to condition granting Gibson Lexbury's withdrawal motion on
25 discovery responses. This is particularly true because Greenberg Traurig has moved to substitute

26
27 ¹ The motion does not explicitly mention Lowry, but refers to Gibson Lexbury, LLP. Because
28 both Gibson and Lowry represent Defendants in their capacity as attorneys at Gibson Lexbury,
the Court construes the motion as Lowry seeking to withdraw her representation as well.

1 into this case and may be able to help 1.4g and Red Apple provide the missing responses.
2 Additionally, Jiangxi may move to compel these responses and seek to extend discovery
3 deadlines if necessary. However, currently, the discovery deadline is not until February 25, 2025,
4 and the dispositive motion deadline is not until May 30, 2025. (ECF No. 85). The Court also
5 finds that Gibson Lexbury has met the requirements of Local Rule IA 11-6(b), and that Greenberg
6 Traurig has met the requirements of Local Rule IA 11-6(c).

7
8 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Gibson Lexbury, LLP's motion to withdraw (ECF
9 No. 90) is **granted**.

10 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Greenberg Traurig, LLP's motion to substitute (ECF
11 No. 97) is **granted**.

12
13 DATED: December 31, 2024

14 
15 _____
16 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28